

## Pepperdine Policy Review

---

Volume 5

Article 5

---

4-20-2012

# The Crisis of America's Soul: How American Leaders Have Betrayed First Principles

Amy L. Kennedy

Pepperdine University, [amy.kennedy@pepperdine.edu](mailto:amy.kennedy@pepperdine.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/ppr>



Part of the [Policy History, Theory, and Methods Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kennedy, Amy L. (2012) "The Crisis of America's Soul: How American Leaders Have Betrayed First Principles," *Pepperdine Policy Review*: Vol. 5, Article 5.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/ppr/vol5/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Public Policy at Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pepperdine Policy Review by an authorized administrator of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Kevin.Miller3@pepperdine.edu](mailto:Kevin.Miller3@pepperdine.edu).

## **The Crisis of America's Soul: How American Leaders Have Betrayed First Principles**

*An opinion piece discussing the need for First Principles in policymaking*

Amy Kennedy

Unfortunately, America is in a state very similar to the Great Depression. Our economy is still struggling, and although unemployment is improving, there is still a high level of unemployment (about 8.2 percent).<sup>i</sup> In addition, the government approval rating is at an all-time low (81 percent of Americans are dissatisfied with the way government is running according to a Gallup poll completed in September 2011).<sup>ii</sup> However, what's more disturbing than the economy or the level of Americans who are dissatisfied with government is the level at which American leaders, such as members of Congress, are out of touch with Americans and American principles.

We are in an age where Jersey Shore had around 3.89 million viewers for its final episode alone whereas voter participation from 2008 to 2010 dropped by 19 million.<sup>iii</sup> Even though these statistics are not necessarily comparable to each other, they are an indication of Americans' interests in this decade. Viewers from five Jersey Shore final episodes exceed the loss of voters from 2008 to 2010. This statistic shows that citizens are growing more disillusioned with the government in recent years and are probably more interested with what is going on in Snooki's life.<sup>iv</sup> Many Americans believe the Federal government has too much power, and members of Congress are doing a less than satisfactory job.<sup>v</sup> Yet, this should not be seen as a surprise. Just in the past year Americans witnessed an American President who authorized the killing of an American citizen overseas without a trial.<sup>vi</sup> Just as bad, or arguably worse, Congress passed the

“America the Battlefield” amendment in the National Defense Authorization Act Section 1031 which identifies American soil as a “battlefield” and permits the President to indefinitely detain an American citizen suspected of terrorist activities without a trial or court order. Republican Congressman Justin Amash has called it “one of the most anti-liberty pieces of legislation of our lifetime.”<sup>vii</sup> Is it any wonder that Americans feel so detached and isolated from the government that is supposed to be serving them?

American leaders should be concerned. We are a country founded upon principles established by our forefathers that are passed on with each generation. Overtime, however, these principles slowly weakened in the growth of the Federal government, with the expansion of Executive power, and with the weakening of state and local government.<sup>viii</sup> Therefore, this article addresses first principles that policymakers should once again follow. Without a return to these principles, our country will continue to head in the direction of an administrative state of which Alexis de Tocqueville warned.<sup>ix</sup> Additionally, this article addresses the traditional view of individualism and how that view should change in future policymaking endeavors. Finally, this article is addressed to policy schools in order to motivate administrators to establish programs which incorporate first principles necessary for public service. By establishing and re-enforcing those principles policy students, who are the nation’s future policymakers, will not forget the foundations on which to base their policies nor the country which they serve.

### **Principles of the American Forefathers**

When the forefathers wrote the constitution, their perspective and goals were based upon their experience with England, which meant avoiding tyranny, maintaining decentralized power, and having a government based on the consent of the people for the public good. The four foundations that the forefathers based the constitution and the future development of America

upon were: 1) a government run by the consent of the people; 2) a balanced government; 3) a limited federal government; and 4) a government which encouraged democratic participation by American citizens.<sup>x</sup> When the constitution was written, the forefathers ensured that the new federal covenant “would rest upon the direct will of the people.”<sup>xi</sup> Additionally, citizens could propose amendments to the constitution which state legislatures would ratify by three-fourths majority. This was proposed in order to honor popular sovereignty which was a staple in America at this time. Having the constitutional powers based on the consent of the people meant “the United States was now, not a confederation, not an alliance of state governments, but a true federation, one in which the powers of both the central government and the state governments rested upon a clear delegation by the people.”<sup>xii</sup> Americans required that the government be based on consent by the people, and government acted based on the authority of the people.

Even more important than consent was the requirement for a limited government: “A proper understanding of government involves not only what governments can do, and how they gain their authority to do it, but what governments, if they honor right and justice, cannot do.”<sup>xiii</sup> After the Articles of the Constitution were written, amendments were drafted to limit the power of the Federal government (eventually the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment was passed which also limited state governments in order to protect the natural rights of all citizens). These limitations were inspired by Locke’s theories to natural rights, which he claimed were inherent in all human beings. Overall, the amendments protected rights to life, liberty, property, free speech, free religion, fair trial, due process, and so on in order that Americans rights were not violated as they were under English rule. A limited government was the most guaranteed protection against tyranny.<sup>xiv</sup>

Another important principle was composing a balanced government. To the founders, this meant a government that had separate branches with overlapping powers in order to create a

system of checks and balances.<sup>xv</sup> The idea behind this was for each branch to have enough overlap with other branches to secure its own independence:

If the legislature grabs for too much power, the executive can fight back with a frequent use of veto. If the executive abuses power, the House can impeach and the Senate try and remove from office. If the executive and Congress join in approving self-serving or unconstitutional legislation, the courts can disallow such laws. If judges abuse power, they face impeachment. This means an almost thermostatic balance.<sup>xvi</sup>

Once again, a balanced government was necessary to avoid an abuse of power by any of the governmental branches in order to protect the interests of the American people, and additionally, to ensure that the government was dependent upon the people. Federal powers were not intended to overcome the checks and balances system nor to exclude the consent of the people.

Another aspect of government limitation was through moral order. The founders believed that a theistic foundation existed in order to create a moral order, which enforced natural rights.<sup>xvii</sup> Through this moral order, limitations would be placed on government:

[T]he unifying foundations of religion, the essential and universal content, provided the sources of authority for morality, and thus for natural law and natural rights that defined the proper end of, and set the limitations on government . . . Here was where all Americans could unite.<sup>xviii</sup>

Jefferson and Adams feared what atheism would do to the country because a loss of any conception of a god or central authority “would leave people ruthless, cynical, and without respect for law and right.”<sup>xix</sup> Even Jefferson argued that liberties could never be secure unless people believed that those liberties came from a higher power. Without a higher power, Americans would focus only on their own selfish ambitions and that social disorder would result.

Finally, the founders desired democratic participation. They believed that the people were the “guardians of liberty” and therefore, they needed to be involved in government and policymaking.<sup>xx</sup> The protection of the vote, for example, was a very important part of the founder’s objectives. There were four amendments made about voting in order to ensure

participation in the governmental process.<sup>xxi</sup> The New England experience was based upon town meetings where a consensus was formed regarding town policies, elected delegates, and local matters. The founders desired to ensure that democratic participation would not dissipate, but would protect citizens involvement in the process, freely choosing their leaders, and able to act against the majority when necessary. Included in this desire was for citizens to feel part of the community, having a vested interest, so that they responded to democratic participation as if their vote mattered.<sup>xxii</sup> Furthermore, the founders promoted maintaining traditional principles, such as protecting natural rights, in order to protect citizen's liberties and to provide Americans with a purpose beyond selfish ambition and for the public good. Being involved and having a vested interest in one's property and community created an environment with purpose, direction, and standards.

Therefore, American founders wanted to ensure a government run by the consent of the people, a balanced government, a limited government supported by moral order, and a government where citizens were involved, had a voice, and served a greater purpose than themselves. These are the principles that America is founded upon. However, the rise of the assumptions of individualism changed American policies and altered the way in which these goals were met, thus, leading to a direction for America which American forefathers had not intended.

### **Assumptions of Individualism**

Before looking at first principles that policy makers need to follow, it is important that the reader clearly understand the assumptions which our country was founded upon in its pursuit of individualism and progress. The following are the assumptions behind individualism. Individualism, from which liberalism arises, is defined as freedom of the individual from all ties,

associations, status, and customs.<sup>xxiii</sup> Through this freedom, man will return to his natural state, and in that state, his full potential will be reached.<sup>xxiv</sup> Progress is generally found in the “atomization of ancient securities” or ridding an individual of all societal ties.<sup>xxv</sup> As a result, individuals are freed by reason, their own reason, and not reason found in the “historical process of use and wont, of habit and prejudice.”<sup>xxvi</sup> Additionally, the State<sup>xxvii</sup> frees men by creating all things equal and removing or weakening institutions which enslave men, keeping them away from natural freedom.<sup>xxviii</sup> Only through the power of the State will men be able to free themselves from “the torments and insecurities and dissensions of ordinary society” through the creation of equality and fairness.<sup>xxix</sup> Through all this, freedom arises from an “impersonal, natural, economic order” which naturally follows.<sup>xxx</sup> Finally, with this change, “the People” are created and solely connected to the State in equality and freedom.<sup>xxxi</sup>

All these assumptions are based on flawed logic. The issue with these assumptions is that this “hypothetical being,” which all ideas and predictions regarding individualism are based upon, is composed of imaginary characteristics and unfounded results.<sup>xxxii</sup> All humans have some level of ties to community, family, and culture. Never has there been a human who had no ties to anything. Even a baby raised alone on an undiscovered island has ties to his own experiences and way of life. Thus, as a result of these assumptions American society has dramatically transformed away from the direction set by our forefathers. Instead of a democracy, America is becoming an administrative State filled with atomized and disconnected individuals who are neither happy nor free. Additionally, these assumptions which policy makers depend upon are leading ever closer to the state which our forefathers had originally escaped from: a totalitarian state. Individuals depend upon the government for entitlement handouts instead of their family, community, or local church. Americans look to the government to solve the

majority of problems today such as poverty, poor education, or gang violence instead of working together to solve these issues locally within the community. These are the signs of a totalitarian state: where the government is the major source of authority, and the people are subservient to the government. That is where America is heading.

In order to avoid a totalitarian state, policy makers must act in contradiction to the common knowledge definition of traditional individualism and freedom. For example, the aspects of society which rationalists needed to remove in order to find “freedom” are actually necessary to the individual being free. Additionally, individualism cannot separate from society, and society cannot separate from the individual. Hence, policy makers, in order to return to first principles necessary for the survival of American society: 1) need to encourage and maintain traditional associations; 2) need to encourage civic involvement in the township or on the local level; 3) must maintain traditional principles and morals which are necessary to the survival of a society; 4) must only use the power given to it by the consent of the citizens, and as a result, must limit the current federal power; and finally, 5) must change the definition and view of individualism/liberalism for future policies. These principles will return American society to the society our forefathers envisioned and will draw America away from the totalitarian state that it is gradually becoming.

### **Returning to Community**

First and most importantly, policy makers need to encourage and maintain associations such as family, churches, and community centers. This will once again give Americans a vested interest in their communities, a strong moral order, and a reason to invest in local and national government. Nisbet’s *Quest for Community* is a great example of the value of associations, and the detriment which results when they are taken away.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Associations are necessary bonds to



human society without which the individual cannot thrive.<sup>xxxiv</sup> Individuals discover who they are in relation to the groups they are involved in or associate with. Morals are found through religion or at least through humanistic morals established in society. Identity is found through family, friends, education, experiences, and thus, those associations are necessary for the individual. The reason for this is that associations are the support system of society, which is evident in the fact that associations were sufficient for many years without any form of commonwealth.<sup>xxxv</sup> Finally, individual beliefs are only found by comparing and contrasting other beliefs and experiences to form one's own. Therefore, associations did not need the commonwealth to direct them or meet the needs of individuals. With associations, the individual finds himself and freedom through gained reasoning and understanding of who he is and what he believes in, his ties and connections, and his morals.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

Individuals also need societal associations in order to find stability. Without them individual chaos results because the individual has no limits and no answers.<sup>xxxvii</sup> Thus, by separating individuals from society, the individual is separated from individuality- there are no boundaries and therefore, the individual cannot decide who she is or what she believes in.<sup>xxxviii</sup> As a result, democracy is only found in maintaining and encouraging associations in order to balance “organization of personal freedom that is the condition of a creative and enduring culture.”<sup>xxxix</sup>

Unfortunately, American society is facing an epidemic of loneliness and anxiety<sup>xl</sup> as a result of the nation's pursuit of traditional individualism.<sup>xli</sup> Disorganization was originally believed to be the road to progress; however, it instead resulted in a communal moral decay.<sup>xlii</sup> Society rid itself of “restraining” institutions, and yet, left nothing to replace them to meet the needs that were once met.<sup>xliii</sup> As a result:

Individualism has resulted in masses of normless, unattached, insecure individuals who lose even the capacity for independent, creative living. The highest rates of suicide and insanity, Durkheim discovered, are to be found in those areas of society in which moral and social individualism is greatest.<sup>xliv</sup>

Policy makers must not let society continue in this direction, but instead, must bring associations back as resources for the individual and for the benefit of society.

Another issue which arises with the removal of associations is the strengthening relationship between the individual and the State. By removing associations from society or at least weakening them, the State took the place of associations. The goal of citizens in early America was to strengthen the relationship between the individual and the State because the State provided equality and fairness.<sup>xlv</sup> Tocqueville describes this when he speaks of Americans love for equality more than freedom: Americans were willing to give up freedom in order to secure equality.<sup>xlvi</sup> However, the unintended result is that citizens turned to the State to provide security and to fulfill the needs that associations left behind.<sup>xlvii</sup> Extreme centralization of government resulted, the opposite of American forefathers' intentions. Additionally, the involvement of the State created more problems than good:

When even the ideas of humanitarian liberalism are consigned by the intellectual to the same charnel house that holds the bones of capitalism and nationalism, his emancipation is complete. He is now free-in all his solitary misery.<sup>xlviii</sup>

Due to the weakening of associations and strengthening of the relationship between the individual and the State, American society is now increasingly without values and direction.<sup>xlix</sup> This is a result of the State not recognizing the value of the "small area" relationships and therefore, not supporting them.<sup>l</sup> Before the State became the dominant societal relation in an individual's life, the village or town brought members together and a consensus was formed.<sup>li</sup> The local assembly held members accountable and provided direction, both morally and socially, through customs and traditional principles.<sup>lii</sup> However, with the assumptions behind

individualism, the State traded associations for equality and freedom.<sup>liii</sup> Thus, all that remains is the ever-stronger relationship between the individual and the State, and a sense of alienation and frustration by modern-day individuals.<sup>liv</sup>

Unfortunately, alienation is not the only problem resulting from the changing societal relationships. With the strengthening of the relationship between the individual and the State, society is climbing ever closer to becoming the totalitarian state that Tocqueville warned would arise out of the pursuit of individualism and equality.<sup>lv</sup> With the destruction of associations, a political community is formed which derives all-purpose and sense of meaning from the State.<sup>lvi</sup> Men are slowly drawn into the will of the State which regulates every aspect of life, stifling the creativity and independence of men.<sup>lvii</sup> As a result, society will eventually become a “soulless, tradition-less mass” in a “spiritual and cultural vacuum.”<sup>lviii</sup>

This is the true horror of totalitarianism. The absolute political community, centralized and omniscient, founded upon the atomized masses, must ceaselessly destroy all those autonomies and immunities that are in normal society the indispensable sources of the capacity for freedom and organization. Total political centralization can lead only to social and cultural death.<sup>lix</sup>

This is the tragedy, which results from individualism without associations, “social and cultural death.” That is why policy makers must support associations and increase association influence when making new policies.<sup>lx</sup> This will allow America to avoid this tragedy and in fact, to turn it around.

### **Returning to the “Township”**

Tocqueville warned of the result of equality and the power of the state in *Democracy in America*. Yet, he held that the township and township power, not associations per se, allowed Americans to have a democracy which did not result in a totalitarian state by distributing political power across many. He was right. Thus, another first principle policy makers must

maintain and promote is to return power to local governments, and as a result, involve public members on a local level in government decisions.

When Tocqueville visited America, he saw the power and love of the township. The township was freedom for the American people because it allowed the people to exercise their rights, voice, and influence. Also, the township was in line with the will of the people because it developed through laws, mores, and customs of a town.<sup>lxi</sup> That is where freedom was found. Without it, the government no longer had the “spirit of freedom” because then the will of the people did not govern, and thus, the government was not really free.<sup>lxii</sup>

New Englanders loved the township because it provided ordered freedom through the participation:

[H]e habituates himself to the forms without which freedom proceeds only through revolutions, permeates himself with their spirit, gets a taste for order, understands the harmony of powers, and finally assembles clear and practical ideas on the nature of his duties as well as the extent of his rights.<sup>lxiii</sup>

Through the township, citizens were assigned to public offices in order to involve them in the government and government decisions.<sup>lxiv</sup> As a result, Americans loved their country and had a sense of purpose as well as freedom because the people were the sole source of power.<sup>lxv</sup> Also, the township provided a place for Americans to become involved in government since it was “worth his trouble to seek to direct.”<sup>lxvi</sup> All citizens had an opportunity to be a part of the township, and it existed for their purposes seemingly “directed by the hands of God” because order was so natural.<sup>lxvii</sup> Township life benefited the citizens since individuals felt that their voice mattered, and that their participation was necessary to the success of the town. As a result, citizens loved their towns and their country. Even Tocqueville was impressed with Americans involvement, and their love of the country. He commented that:

In the United States the native country makes itself felt everywhere. It is an object of solicitude from the village to the entire Union. The inhabitant applies himself to each of the interests of his country as to his very own. He is glorified in the glory of the nation; in the success that it obtains he believes he recognizes his own work, and he is uplifted by it; he rejoices in the general prosperity from which he profits. He has for his native country a sentiment analogous to the one that he feels for his family, and it is still by a sort of selfishness that he takes an interest in the state.<sup>lxviii</sup>

This picture of America is so beautiful and yet, so far from where we are now. So where have the township and the love of American government gone? The answer: power became centralized, and the power of the township was no longer the focus of the people.

America is in an age where the federal government and government agencies are the sole power, and state government is secondary in importance and strength.<sup>lxix</sup> This is not how our forefathers intended America's government structure. Originally, the states were "little sovereign nations," and the federal government was "exceptional and circumscribed [which] applie[d] only to general interests."<sup>lxx</sup> That was the beauty of American government in the beginning: citizens loved their towns and their country, felt a part of a community and free, all as a result of the promotion of townships and township life in early America. As noted earlier, due to of the pursuit of traditional liberalism through individualism (defined as free from all associations) the relationship between the individual and the State strengthened while relationships with associations or townships grew ever weaker.<sup>lxxi</sup>

Tocqueville warned of an administrative state arising from democracy which would leave individuals "confused in a common mass:"

I am convinced, furthermore, that no nations are more at risk of falling under the yoke of administrative centralization than those whose social state is democratic . . . . The permanent tendency of these nations is to concentrate all governmental power in the hands of the sole power that directly represents the people, because beyond the people one perceives no more than equal individuals confused in a common mass.<sup>lxxii</sup>

This results from the desire to have a concentrated representation of the people. Also, democracy often draws a people towards greater restrictions and power in the state in order to promote equality.<sup>lxxiii</sup> As a result, citizens in democratic societies seek central power in order to promote equality while also seeking individualism free from associations.<sup>lxxiv</sup> Thus, all other associations and relationships are intended to be weakened or altogether removed so that the individual may find “true” equality and freedom.

Unfortunately, “true equality” and “freedom” led to the current problems with individuals in society today: feelings of no voice in government, lack of purpose, lessened community involvement, and so on. Therefore, the township or local government power needs to be returned to avoid Tocqueville’s dreadful prediction: that Americans “the same men who from time to time overturn a throne and ride roughshod over kings, bend more and more without resistance to the slightest will of a clerk.”<sup>lxxv</sup> Policy makers need to bring back the form of government where the people were involved, loved their country, had a political purpose, and through those aspects, found freedom. America was once the country where the people reigned. As Tocqueville said:

The people participate in the drafting of laws by the choice of the legislators, in their application, by the election of the agents of the executive power; one can say that they govern themselves, so weak and restricted is the part left to the administration, so much does the latter feel its popular origin and obey the power from which it emanates. The people reign over the American political world as does God over the universe. They are the cause and the end of all things; everything comes out of them and everything is absorbed into them.<sup>lxxvi</sup>

This picture described by Tocqueville is the ideal that policy makers need to return to in order to give government back to the people, a government where the people are “the cause and end of all things.” As a result, the freedom and government that our forefathers intended will reveal itself again.

### **Returning to a Moral Order & Traditional Principles**

The founders knew the value of a moral order established by traditional principles, such as natural rights, which is why they encouraged a belief in a higher moral authority. So, in addition to encouraging township freedom, policy makers need to once again support traditional principles and a moral order, which were formed over generations, in order to not only help American societies survive, but also to help them thrive. Edward Burke was a great promoter of maintaining traditional values and principles.<sup>lxxvii</sup> More importantly, he was correct in his fear of the society that would develop if those principles were taken away in the new era of “individual reason.” In his view, society could not thrive in the new ideals of “individual reason.” He wrote to a “gentleman in Paris” during the French Revolution lamenting the new rage for “reason” free from all traditional principles and morals.<sup>lxxviii</sup> Although Burke recognizes the need for change in order to conserve society, he fears the “total contempt . . . of all ancient institutions.”<sup>lxxix</sup>

In our aggressive pursuit for individualism, American society attempts to remove traditional principles and institutions, calling them archaic, outdated, and un-relatable to modern times. However, by removing these foundations of society, America is left with “counterfeit wares” which do not meet the needs of individuals.<sup>lxxx</sup> Burke points out that these principles are hereditary, built over generations with enough wisdom that one man could not form in a lifetime; hence, “in what we improve we are never wholly new; in what we retain, we are never wholly obsolete.”<sup>lxxxi</sup> With principles, society has order, answers, and responses to old and new situations. Although these principles adjust with time, in order that principles stay relevant to modern society, the core principles that succeed in society remain.

By removing these principles in the pursuit of individualism and liberalism, individuals “have no compass to govern [them]; nor can [they] know distinctly to what port [they] steer.”<sup>lxxxii</sup> However, as a result of principles, citizens love their country.<sup>lxxxiii</sup> Values induce pride in the commonwealth and strengthen a society.<sup>lxxxiv</sup> They establish mores to follow and “soften” the coarseness of life. Without the “super-added” ideas built over many generations, society is left bare without direction and without love from her citizens.<sup>lxxxv</sup> What individual can love a country that has no value or tie to his existence? That is what individualism and/or liberalism without principles creates: an empty husk which no longer has substance.<sup>lxxxvi</sup>

Finally, these principles create an ordered freedom. Burke is correct that the best freedom is ordered freedom. Freedom without restraints leads to chaos because “[t]he effect of liberty to individuals is that they may do as they please . . . .”<sup>lxxxvii</sup> Yet, with inherited principles Americans have a “tempered” freedom. This is explained by Burke’s statement:

Through the same plan of a conformity to nature in our artificial institutions, and by calling in the aid of her unerring and powerful instincts to fortify the fallible and feeble contrivances of our reason, we have derived several other, and those no small, benefits, from considering our liberties in the light of an inheritance. Always acting as if the presence of canonized forefathers, the spirit of freedom, leading in itself to misrule and excess, is tempered with awful gravity.<sup>lxxxviii</sup>

America freedom is “tempered” with the principles carried from generation to generation since our forefathers created this nation. Principles provide wisdom gained over generations which survived because of their value to society. Thus, only through remembrance of traditional principles will America’s society survive, will society be protected from the State, and will individuals once again have a sense of purpose, community, and freedom.

Policy makers must recognize traditional principles of society as a benefit to the individual and society overall. Principles do not destroy individualism, but instead strengthen it by providing a purpose for each individual. Principles also provide many frames of reference



from which the individual can develop his own style of living and his own philosophies of life. It was a great mistake to develop policy on a belief that individuals and society in general can survive without history, without morals, and without hereditary principles.

### **Returning to Consent of the People**

Thus, there is another important first principle to guide policy makers: the concept of consent and gaining that consent through the local government. Locke was a supporter of the concept of popular consent for a ruling government, and a social contract needed to ensure that the government worked for the public good. Although he is not correct on all points,<sup>lxxxix</sup> Locke is correct with regard to personal freedom being the limit that a person can “give” to the government; that consent is necessary for government action; and that the relationship between the individual and government is a social contract. In general, Locke’s theories reflect the issue with the power of the federal government today. The federal government is much more powerful than was intended, and now it is beginning to control many areas of life that should be left to the individual. Yet, the purpose of the government is to “preserve and enlarge freedom.”<sup>xc</sup> In order to preserve and enlarge freedom, the federal government needs a reduction in power and influence. Enlargement of freedom will only come when more power returns to the local level, which is found in the township. Once this takes place, Americans have the freedom to choose where to live dependent upon the laws of the state government:

[W]hereas, it being only a necessary condition annexed to the land which is under that government, reaches only those who will take it on that condition, and so is no natural tie or engagement, but a voluntary submission; for every man's ancestors ever were, may, whilst they are in that freedom, choose what society they will join themselves to, what commonwealth they will put themselves under.<sup>xc</sup>

This is true freedom in America, because the township creates the laws, based on the mores and principles of the local peoples, and then citizens can choose which local society to be a part.

Finally, the power of the local society is given by the citizens who live in the state and participate in government: this is the ideal that our forefathers intended and the original structure of American local government.

### **Application of the People's Consent**

So how should policy makers address the concerns with the federal government?

Although the federal government's complete abolishment is not a possibility,<sup>xcii</sup> it is possible to return it the level of power given via consent. The federal government was prohibited from performing societal acts without the consent of the people, and must return to that original structure. This will provide security for individual's interests and will create a community of citizens who support the local government as a result of their consent giving the government its power.<sup>xciii</sup> Through the consent given, society acts in a "voluntary union" through "mutual agreement" choosing the government they desire and the power bestowed upon it.<sup>xciv</sup>

Yet, what is the extent of consent? Locke felt that consent was given tacitly by simply being in a country, using its roads and visiting its businesses.<sup>xcv</sup> This is correct under modern day law of personal jurisdiction; however, the concern is that the federal government acts as if it has the consent of all citizens merely because they live within the United States. There is a fallacy here. Since the federal government has grown so powerful over the years, it is not possible for American citizens to move to another state with more agreeable laws because federal laws are numerous and apply to all states. Policy makers need to return to the intended structure of a small federal government, giving more power to the states, and as a result, the consent of the people will once again play a role in the government that directs and protects them. Consent ties in with the idea of a social contract: the people give consent to the government, and the government works for the good of the people within the constraint of the consent given.

The social contract is another theory of Locke's, and it still applies today; yet Americans are unable to act upon it. Whenever the government violates the social contract, then citizens are free to leave according to Locke:

For all power given with trust for attaining an end being limited by that end, whenever that end is manifestly neglected or opposed, the trust must necessarily be forfeited, and the power devolve into the hands of those that have it, who may place it anew where they shall think best for their safety and security.<sup>xcvi</sup>

Yet, at this time Americans cannot leave the reach of the federal government because it has grown enormously in power over past years. The federal government was never meant to have the power it possesses today. America is in a time where the government can control the food Americans eat or take away property without compensation which was legally purchased. This is arguably not for the benefit of society because it takes away the rights of Americans without all Americans giving consent<sup>xcvii</sup> for the government to do so. Arguably, the federal government is “impoverishing” Americans versus working for the public good.<sup>xcviii</sup> In that case, the social contract is violated.

If policy makers choose not to work for the public good by fulfilling the social contract with society, then America is gravitating toward a season where the government is in a “state of war” with the people. As Locke says:

[U]sing force upon the people, without authority, and contrary to the trust put in him that does so, is a state of war with the people, who have a right to reinstate their legislature in the exercise of their power.<sup>xcix</sup>

Thus, policy makers must return to the social contract supported by consent between the people and the State, working for the benefit of the people and decreasing the power of the federal government so that once again consent may be given on a local level. Through consent, American's rights are protected, and the people are given a voice in the government which is originally was run by the people.

These are the principles America needs to return to, promoting associations, maintaining a moral order and traditional principles, encouraging participation in the township, and ensuring governmental action based on the consent of the people. One of the major steps to bring about these changes is to transform the assumptions behind individualism and for policy makers to apply the transformed assumptions for future policy making.

### **Returning to a View of Associated Man**

We've already examined the assumptions behind individualism, but what about the history? In contrast to Burke are the theories of Locke and Rousseau which claim that man is free when he has no societal restraints. He is then in his natural state, and he can reach his fullest potential. However, Locke and Rousseau were mistaken. There can be no "natural man" without ties to associations or with complete freedom from all restraints. Rousseau is a classic example of adhering to the wrong definition of individualism. He attempts to show that modernity and society were the worst things for a human because with these ties and influences that human was no longer free (understanding freedom as limitless or having no restraints). He describes the soul as being "modified" by society:

[T]he human soul modified in a society by a thousand ever-recurring causes, by the acquisition of a mass of knowledge and errors, by mutations taking place in the constitution of the body, and by the constant impact of the passions, has changed in appearance to the point of becoming almost unrecognizable, and is no longer to be found . . . we discover only the false clash of passion believing itself to be reasoning and understanding inflamed to delirium.<sup>c</sup>

Rousseau's argument is that modernity, through its formation of the concept of property and reason, corrupted man's "natural freedom." He felt that by stripping individuals of all "supernatural gifts" and "artificial faculties" gained over time, man will live simply:

"I see him satisfying his hunger under an oak, quenching his thirst at the first stream, finding his bed under the same tree which provided his meal; and, behold, his needs are furnished."<sup>ci</sup>

However, as noted in *Quest for Community*, removing all associations, all societal reason, morals, and principles, has not brought individuals to a satisfied free state. Instead, it led to “atomization” of the individual, increased loneliness, anxiety, and lack of purpose. That is not the natural state of man. Rousseau was wrong because his theory assumes that the individual is separable from society. But as can be seen by present day levels of anxiety and sense of alienation, this cannot be true. Nisbet’s theory is correct; associations support the hereditary principles which are needed to stabilize and direct individuals as described by Burke, and provide the road to individualism. Natural man could never really exist because man cannot survive without associations, societal relationships, and hereditary principles. If he did exist, he will not be happy but alienated and alone in his “solitary misery.” This is a lesson for policy makers who are so keen to bring citizens closer to the traditional definition of individualism; they are slowly eviscerating the substance of traditional American society.

### **New Assumptions Behind Individualism**

To return to the founders’ original intentions for American government, an important step is for policy makers to re-define liberalism from the traditional view to a holistic view incorporating all the first principles that are forgotten. As evident from the consequences noted above, policy makers must change their view of individualism and the “liberalism” it creates.<sup>cii</sup> It was thought that order and freedom would result through a “natural equilibrium and of economic and political forces” by removing “all the inherited personal interdependences of traditional community.”<sup>ciii</sup> However, the old view of man free from all associations, customs, and traditional principles left Americans as “disunited, despairing masses.”<sup>civ</sup> Nisbet best describes this effect:

Whereas modern liberalism began in the eighteenth century with an image of man as inherently self-sufficing and secure beyond the effect of all social change, the

contemporary image of man is, as we have seen, the image of the people that glowed in the minds of such men as Jefferson was composed of elements supplied, actually, by a surrounding society strong in its social institutions and memberships, the image of a society that now haunts man is one composed of the disunited, despairing masses.<sup>cv</sup>

Again, the reason for this unpredicted result is that all the “self-sufficient” attributes that society regarded as the “timeless, natural, qualities of the individual” failed to recognize that these attributes were founded in societal organizations, relationships, and the township.<sup>cvi</sup> Societal organizations such as religious institutions, small town communities, local public offices, and so forth are necessary for individuals to not only be free: but to have a purpose and to find a satisfaction in existence. Policy makers need to fundamentally change the view of individualism in its relation to associations and also, to once again involve the townships in government decisions. The individual and/or human nature can never be understood without understanding the surrounding relationships:

Whatever may lie neurologically embedded in the human being, the product of physical history, we know that a knowledge of man's actual behavior in society must from the outset take into consideration the whole stock of norms and cultural incentives which are the product of social history. The normative order in society is fundamental to all understanding of human nature.<sup>cvii</sup>

In the continued pursuance of the traditional view of individualism to strengthen democracy, government in fact is weakening human autonomy and cultural freedom by constantly increasing the strength and extent of public administration.

Democracy, far from heightening human autonomy and cultural freedom, seems rather to have aided in the process of mechanization that has weakened them. It must be repeated again, however, that this is not the inevitable consequence of the democratic ideal of power vested residually in the people. It is the consequence of the systems of public administration which we have grafted onto the democratic ideal.<sup>cviii</sup>

By continuing this path, America will experience a severe loss in cultural richness and individual happiness and sense of belonging. As a result, individuals will continually seek the State as the provider of the needs that associations and small government once filled, and the State will

become an over-bloated administrative power that in effect is removing the substance of the society it runs:

When the small areas of association become sterile psychologically, as the result of loss of institutional significance, we find ourselves resorting to ever-increasing dosages of indoctrination from above, an indoctrination that often becomes totalitarian in significance. We find ourselves with a society that suffers increasingly from . . . apoplexy at the center and anemia at the extremities.<sup>cix</sup>

## Conclusion

In conclusion, policy makers must return to these first principles and change the assumptions behind individualism in order to avoid a totalitarian state and the disappearance of American society through the weakening of associations, local government, moral order, and purpose for individuals. Only when policy makers apply these principles as a priority in all of their policies will America return to the state that our forefathers intended, one that will continue to thrive for many centuries.

---

<sup>i</sup> Censky, A. (2012, April 6). *March jobs report: Hiring slows, unemployment falls*. Retrieved from March jobs report: Hiring slows, Unemployhttp://money.cnn.com/2012/04/06/news/economy/jobs-report-unemployment/index.htmment falls.

<sup>ii</sup> Muskal, M. (2011, September 26). *Gallup poll: Dissatisfaction with government at record levels*. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/2011/sep/26/news/la-pn-gallup-poll-senate-disaster-vote-20110926.

<sup>iii</sup> TV By The Numbers. (2012, March 16). *Cable ratings*. Retrieved from http://tvbythenumbers.zap2it.com/2012/03/16/thursday-cable-ratings-jersey-shore-swamp-people-mudcats-ncaa-basketball/124730/.

<sup>iv</sup> A cast member of the Jersey Shore.

<sup>v</sup> 69 percent say they have little or no confidence in the legislative branch of government, an all-time high and up from 63 percent in 2010; 57 percent have little or no confidence in the federal government to solve domestic problems, exceeding the previous high of 53 percent recorded in 2010 and well exceeding the 43 percent who have little or no confidence in the government to solve international problems; 53 percent have little or no confidence in the men and women who seek or hold elected office; Americans believe, on average, that the federal government wastes 51 cents of every tax dollar, similar to a year ago, but up significantly from 46 cents a decade ago and from an average 43 cents three decades ago; 49 percent of Americans believe the federal government has become so large and powerful that it poses an immediate threat to the rights and freedoms of ordinary citizens. In 2003, less than a third (30 percent) believed this. Saad, L. (2011, September 26). *Americans express historic negativity toward u.s. government*. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/149678/Americans-Express-Historic-Negativity-Toward-Government.aspx.

<sup>vi</sup> Eddlem, T. (2011, November 29). *Judge, jury, and executioner-should presidents have a license to kill?*. Retrieved from http://thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/9840-judge-jury-and-executioner-should-presidents-have-a-license-to-kill; “Dennis Blair told the House Intelligence Committee US forces can assassinate Americans believed to be involved in terrorist activity against the United States. Blair said, quote, ‘Being a US citizen will not spare an American from getting assassinated by military

or intelligence operatives overseas if the individual is working with terrorists and planning to attack fellow Americans.’ He added, ‘We don’t target people for free speech; we target them for taking action that threatens Americans.’” Democracy Now. (2010, February 9). < headlines | next story > Tuesday, February 9, 2010 full show Obama administration: Us forces can assassinate Americans believed to be involved in terrorist activity. Retrieved from [http://www.democracynow.org/2010/2/9/obama\\_administration\\_us\\_forces\\_can\\_assassinate](http://www.democracynow.org/2010/2/9/obama_administration_us_forces_can_assassinate).

<sup>vii</sup> Harger, J. (2011, November 28). *U.S. Rep. Justin Amash opposes defense authorization bill, calling it "anti-liberty"*, Retrieved from [http://www.mlive.com/news/grandrapids/index.ssf/2011/11/us\\_rep\\_justin\\_amash\\_opposes\\_de.html](http://www.mlive.com/news/grandrapids/index.ssf/2011/11/us_rep_justin_amash_opposes_de.html).

<sup>viii</sup> 50 percent of Americans think the Federal Government has too much influence over the states. Roff, P. (2011, August 25). *Poll: Most Americans think the federal government has too much power*. Retrieved from <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/peter-roff/2011/08/25/poll-most-americans-think-the-federal-government-has-too-much-power>.

<sup>ix</sup> "After having thus successively taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small, complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting. Such as power does not destroy but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals of which the government is the shepherd." Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 174.

<sup>x</sup> Paul Conkin, *The Four Foundations of Government*, (Wheeling, The Harlan Davidson, Inc, 1994).

<sup>xi</sup> *ibid.*, p.27.

<sup>xii</sup> *ibid.*, p.29.

<sup>xiii</sup> *ibid.*, p.32.

<sup>xiv</sup> The founding fathers not only saw the value in having the Bill of Rights, or constitutional amendments, but they also felt strongly about having a moral order in America. This is why the founders, regardless of actual beliefs, including Christian references in the majority of the founding documents such as the Declaration of Independence. Even Jefferson argued that without some sort of god or central moral authority individuals would become “rootless, cynical, and without respect for law and right.” *ibid.*, p.70. He also argued that the freedoms of America could not be truly secure unless the citizens believed the freedoms came from God. *ibid.*

<sup>xv</sup> *ibid.*, p.83.

<sup>xvi</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>xvii</sup> *ibid.*, p.68.

<sup>xviii</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>xix</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>xx</sup> *ibid.*, p.100.

<sup>xxi</sup> See United States Constitution Amendments XV, XIX, XXIV, and XXVI.

<sup>xxii</sup> Hence, this is one of the reasons behind only landowners having the right to vote in the early years.

<sup>xxiii</sup> "Competition, individuation, and dislocation of status and custom, impersonality, and moral anonymity were hailed by the rationalist because these were the forces that would be most instrumental in emancipating man from the dead hand of the past and because through them the naturally stable and rational individual would be given an environment in which he could develop illimitable his inherent potentialities." Robert Nisbet, *The Quest For Community*, (Wilmington: ISI Books, 2010), 2.



<sup>xxiv</sup> "In man and his natural affinities lay the bases of order and freedom." *ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>xxv</sup> "[T]he uprooting of family ties, the disintegration of villages, the displacement of craftsmen, and the atomization of ancient securities . . . these were the inevitable costs of Progress." *ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>xxvi</sup> "The innate resources of the individual [sic] prompted a glowing vision of society in which there would be forever abolished the parochialisms and animosities of a world founded upon kinship, village, and church. Reason, founded upon natural interest, would replace the wisdom Burke and his fellow conservatives had claimed to find in historical processes of use and wont, of habit and prejudice." *ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>xxvii</sup> "State" referring mostly to the federal government.

<sup>xxviii</sup> "By its inroads upon the authorities of church, class, and local community the popular State would liberate men—liberate them not only from the oppressions of traditional society but from its intolerable hierarchy. Much of that imagined natural equality which has been lost through the rise of property, the patriarchal family, and ecclesiastical institutions would be restored to man merely through the power of the State used to emancipate men from their historically given statuses." *ibid.*, p.156.

<sup>xxix</sup> "Not only through kinship, class, church, or association can man be freed, for these are the very chains upon his existence. Only by entering into the perfect State and subordinating himself completely to its collective will it be possible for man to escape the torments and insecurities and dissensions of ordinary society." *ibid.*, p.142.

<sup>xxx</sup> "The demands of freedom appeared to be in the direction of the release of large numbers of individuals from the statuses and identities that had been forged in them by the dead hand of the past. A free society would be one in which individuals were morally and socially as well as politically free, free from groups and classes. It would be composed, in short, of socially and morally separated individuals. Order in society would be the product of a natural equilibrium of economic and political forces. Freedom would arise from the individual's release from all the inherited personal interdependences of traditional community, and from his existence in an impersonal, natural, economic order." *ibid.*, p.209.

<sup>xxxi</sup> "If right government was to be made a reality by the rationalists, the 'people' had to be separated from existing institutions and beliefs and brought into the single association of the people's State." *ibid.*, p.232.

<sup>xxxii</sup> "What is significant here is that when the philosophical individualists were dealing with the assumed nature of man, they were dealing in large part with a hypothetical being created by their political imaginations." *ibid.*, p.210.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Robert Nisbet, *The Quest For Community*, (Wilmington: ISI Books, 2010).

<sup>xxxiv</sup> "The family, the civil associations, the corporations and fraternities are all . . . antecedent to the state . . . . The associations, for purposes of trade, religious worship, security, and fellowship, were the bonds of human society before any political ties were established, and they have continued to perform functions indispensable to social life." *ibid.*, p.118.

<sup>xxxv</sup> "Whereby it is plainly to be seen, the societies of men among themselves, to have been at first sought out for the leading of their lives in more safety and quite: and them first of all to have sprung from the love which was betwixt man and wife: from the two have flowed from the mutual love betwixt parents and their children: then the love of brothers and sisters one towards another: and after them the friendship between cousins and other kinsmen: and last of all the love and good will which is betwixt men joined in alliance: which had all at length grown cold, and been utterly extinguished, had it not been nourished, maintained and kept by societies, communities, corporations, and colleges: the union of whom hath for long time in safety maintained many people, without any form of a commonwealth, or sovereign power over them." *ibid.*

<sup>xxxvi</sup> "Whatever may lie neurologically embedded in the human being, the product of physical history, we know that a knowledge of man's actual behavior in society must from the outset take into consideration the whole stock of norms and cultural incentives which are the product of social history. The normative order in society is fundamental to all understanding of human nature . . . . We do not see, think, react, or become stimulated except in terms of the socially inherited norms of human culture." *ibid.*, p.212.

<sup>xxxvii</sup> "From innumerable observations and controlled studies we have learned that the discipline of values within a person has a close and continuing relationship with the discipline of values supported by human interrelationships. 'Only by anchoring his own conduct . . . In something as large, substantial, and super-individual as the culture of a group,' wrote the late Kurt Lewin, 'can the individual stabilize his new beliefs sufficiently to keep them immune from the day to day fluctuations of moods and influences of which he, as an individual, is subject.' *ibid.*, p.213.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> "As we have learned from the recent literature of the concentration camp and from studies of uprooted, and displaced persons, moral conscience, the sense of civilized decency, will not long survive separation from the associative ties that normally

reinforce and give means of expression to the imperatives of conscience. Separate man from the primary contexts of normative association, as the nineteenth-century individualist enjoined in effect, and you separate him not only from the basic values of a culture but from the sources of individuality itself." *ibid.*, p.214.

<sup>xxxix</sup> "Only through its intermediate relationships and authorities has any State ever achieved the balance between organization and personal freedom that is the condition of a creative and enduring culture. These relationships begin with the family and with the small informal social groups which spring up around common interests and cultural needs. Their number extends to the larger associations of society, to the churches, business associations, labor unions, universities, and professions. They are the real sources of liberal democracy." *ibid.*, p.247.

<sup>xi</sup> "Where the lone individual was once held to contain within himself all the propensities of order and progress, he is no quite generally regarded as the very symbol of society's anxiety and insecurity." *ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>xii</sup> "The modern release of the individual from traditional ties of class, religion, and kinship has made him free; but, on the testimony of innumerable works in our age, this freedom is accompanied not by the sense of creative release but by the sense of disenchantment and alienation. The alienation of man from historic moral certitudes has been followed by the sense of man's alienation from fellow man." *ibid.*, p.7; A 1990 Gallup poll found that more than 36 percent of Americans are lonely. Boston Globe. (2011). Retrieved from [http://www.boston.com/globe/search/stories/health/health\\_sense/042296.htm](http://www.boston.com/globe/search/stories/health/health_sense/042296.htm).

<sup>xiii</sup> "It is the sense of disorganization that takes root in the very conditions which to earlier generations of rationalists appeared as the necessary circumstances of progress." p. 6; "There is now a sense of disorganization that ranges all the way from the sociologist's concern with disintegration of the family and small community to the religious prophet's intuition that moral decay is enveloping the whole of Western society." *ibid.*, p.6.

<sup>xiii</sup> "Family, local community, church, and the whole network of informal interpersonal relationship have ceased to play a determining role in our institutional systems of mutual aid, welfare, education, recreation, and economic production and distribution. Yet despite the loss of these manifest institutional functions, and the failure of most of the groups to develop any new institutional functions, we continue to expect them to perform adequately the implicit psychological or symbolic functions in the life of the individual." *ibid.*, p.47.

<sup>xliv</sup> *ibid.*, p.11.

<sup>xlv</sup> "Quite apart from the innumerable agencies of private welfare, the whole tendency of modern political development has been to enhance the role of the political State as a direct relationship among individuals, and to bring both its power and its services ever more intimately into the lives of human beings." *ibid.*, p.42.

<sup>xlvi</sup> Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 479-82.

<sup>xlvii</sup> "[T]he State is a complex of ideas, symbols, and relationships. Unlike either kinship or capitalism, the State has become, in the contemporary world, the supreme allegiance of men and, in most recent times, the greatest refuge from the insecurities and frustrations of other spheres of life." Nisbet, p.92.

<sup>xlviii</sup> *ibid.*, p.196.

<sup>xlix</sup> "Our problem may be ultimately concerned with all of these values and their greater or lesser accessibility to man, but it is, I think, primarily social: social in the exact sense of pertaining to the small areas of membership and association in which these values are ordinarily made meaningful and directive to men." *ibid.*, p.42; Self-reported church or synagogue membership has drifted slowly downward over the past 70 years. The current 61 percent of Americans who report church or synagogue membership is tied with 2007 and 2008 as the lowest in Gallup's history and down significantly from a high of 76 percent in 1947. Newport, F. (2010, December 29) *Near-record high see religion losing influence in America*. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/145409/Near-Record-High-Religion-Losing-Influence-America.aspx>.

<sup>1</sup> "Behind the growing sense of isolation in society, behind the whole quest for community which infuses so many theoretical and practical areas of contemporary life and thought, lies the growing realization that the traditional primary relationships of men have become functionally irrelevant to our State and economy and meaningless to the moral aspirations of individuals." Nisbet, p. 43.

<sup>li</sup> "A village formed what we called a community . . . Not only because the land of every villager lay in the form of strips intermingled with those of his neighbors, because every villager followed the same traditional rotation of crops and sent his cattle to run in a common herd. A village formed a community chiefly because all its members were brought up to consent and act together as a group." *ibid.*, p.76.

lii "A town was more than a simple place of residence and occupation; it was itself a close association, and its members-citizens, in the medieval sense-were bound to live up to its articles and customs almost as rigorously as the peasants on a manor." *ibid.*

liii "[T]he development of the Western State, with all the qualities of power, freedom, rights, and citizenship . . . Has been part of the general process of subordination and destruction of such groups as village, guild, and feudal class. The individual and the State have been brought into ever close legal relationship." *ibid.*, p.101.

liv "After the association into which individuals have been placed as members of society have been dissolved and destroyed . . . the only connecting links that remain between the individual and society are ownership, contract, and the State." *ibid.*, p.104.

lv "I seek to trace the novel features under which despotism may appear in the world. The first thing that strikes the observation is the innumerable multitude of me, all equal and alike, incessantly endeavoring to procure petty and paltry pleasures with which they glut their lives. Each of them, living apart, is as a stranger to the fate of all the rest; his children and his private friends constitute to him the whole of mankind. As for the rest of his fellow citizens, he is close to them, but he does not see them; he touches them, but he does not feel them; he exists only in himself and for himself alone; and if his kindred still remain to him, he may be said at any rate to have lost his country." *ibid.*, p.173.

lvi "This new order is the absolute, the total, political community. As a community it is made absolute by the removal of all forms of membership and identification which might, by their existence, compete with the new order . . . . [I]t is the absolute extension of the structure of the administrative State into the social and psychological realm previously occupied by a plurality of associations. Totalitarianism involves the demolition of autonomous social ties in a population, but it involves, no less, their replacement by new ones, each deriving its meaning and sanction from the central structure of the State." *ibid.*, p.187.

lvii "After having thus successively taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small, complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting. Such as power does not destroy but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals of which the government is the shepherd." *ibid.*, p.174.

lviii "But what was essential was the atomization of the family and of every other type of grouping that intervened between the people as society and the people as a mindless, soulless, tradition-less mass. What the totalitarian must have for the realization of his design is a spiritual and cultural vacuum." *ibid.*, p.186.

lix *ibid.*, p.192.

lx 91 percent of Americans say relationships bring them happiness. Harris Polls. (2010, May 20). *Annual happiness index finds one-third of Americans are very happy*. Retrieved from <http://www.harrisinteractive.com/NewsRoom/HarrisPolls/tabid/447/ctl/ReadCustomDefault/mid/1508/ArticleId/394/Default.aspx>.

lxi "Township freedom therefore eludes, so to speak, the effort of man. Thus, it rarely happens that it is created; it is in a way born of itself. It develops almost secretly in the bosom of a half-barbaric society. It is the continuous action of laws and mores, of circumstances and above all time that comes to consolidate it." Nisbet, p.57.

lxii "It is nonetheless in the township that the force of free peoples resides. The institutions of a township are to freedom what primary schools are to science; they put it within the reach of the people; they make them taste its peaceful employ and habituate them to making use of it. Without the institutions of a township a nation can give itself a free government, but it does not have the spirit of freedom." *ibid.*, p.57-58.

lxiii *ibid.*, p.65.

lxiv "Public offices are extremely numerous and very divided in the township . . . nevertheless, the greatest part of the administrative powers is concentrated in the hands of a small number of individuals elected each year whom they name selectman." *ibid.*, p.59.

lxv "In the township as everywhere, the people are the source of social powers, but nowhere do they exercise their power more immediately. The people in America are a master who has to be pleased up to the furthest limits of the possible." *ibid.*

<sup>lxvi</sup> "The inhabitant of New England is attached to his township not so much because he was born there as because he sees in that township a free and strong corporation that he is a part of and that is worth his trouble to seek to direct." *ibid.*, p.62.

<sup>lxvii</sup> "The township is the sole association that is so much in nature that everywhere men are gathered, a township forms by itself. Township society therefore exists among all peoples, whatever their usages and their laws may be; it is man who makes kingdoms and creates republics; the township appears to issue directly from the hands of God." *ibid.*, p.57.

<sup>lxviii</sup> Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 90.

<sup>lxix</sup> 49 percent of Americans believe the federal government has become so large and powerful that it poses an immediate threat to the rights and freedoms of ordinary citizens. Saad, 2011.

<sup>lxx</sup> "[O]ne sees two governments completely separated and almost independent: one, habitual and undefined, that responds to the daily needs of society, the other, exceptional and circumscribed, that applies only to certain general interests. They are, in a word, twenty-four little sovereign nations, the sum of which forms the great body of the Union . . . . Moreover, the federal government, as I have just said, is only an exception; the government of the states is the common rule." Nisbet, p. 56.

<sup>lxxi</sup> 72 percent of Americans feel their voice is not heard in national decisions. Harris Polls, 2011.

<sup>lxxii</sup> Nisbet, p.91.

<sup>lxxiii</sup> "Thus, the democratic tendency that brings men constantly to multiply the privileges of the state and to restrict the rights of the particular persons is much more rapid and more continuous in democratic peoples subject by their position to great and frequent wars, and whose existence can often be put in great peril, than in all others." *ibid.*, p.649.

<sup>lxxiv</sup> "Men who live in centuries of equality naturally love the central power and willingly extend its privileges; but if it happens that this same power faithfully represents their interests and exactly reproduces their instincts, the confidence they bring to it has almost no bounds, and they believe that all that they give they accord to themselves." *ibid.*

<sup>lxxv</sup> "On the one hand, the firmest dynasties are shaken or destroyed; in all parts peoples violently escape the empire of their laws; they destroy or limit the authority of their lords or of their princes; all nations that are not in revolution at least appear restive and trembling; one and the same spirit of revolt animates them. And on the other hand, in this same time of anarchy and among these same intractable peoples, the social power constantly increases its prerogatives; it becomes more centralized, more enterprising, more absolute, more extensive. At each instant citizens fall under the control of the public administration; they are brought insensibly and almost without their knowing it to sacrifice new parts of their individual independence to it every day, and the same men who from time to time overturn a throne and ride roughshod over kings bend more and more without resistance to the slightest will of a clerk." *ibid.*, p.659.

<sup>lxxvi</sup> *ibid.*, p.55.

<sup>lxxvii</sup> Edward T. Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France In a Letter Intended to have been sent to a Gentleman in Paris*, (1790).

<sup>lxxviii</sup> "Those who cultivate the memory of our Revolution and those who are attached to the constitution of the kingdom will take good care how they are involved with persons, who, under the pretext of zeal toward the Revolution and constitution, too frequently wander from their true principles and are ready on every occasion to depart from the firm but cautious and deliberate spirit which produced the one, and which presides the other." *ibid.*, p.2.

<sup>lxxix</sup> *ibid.*, p.12 (Need change to conserve society); "The dislike I feel to revolutions, the signals for which have so often been given from pulpits; the spirit of change that is gone abroad; the total contempt which prevails you, and may come to prevail with us, of all ancient institutions when set in opposition to a present sense of convenience or to the bent of a present inclination: all these considerations make it not unadvisable, in my opinion, to call back our attention to the true principles of our own domestic laws . . ." *ibid.*, p.14.

<sup>lxxx</sup> "We ought not, on either side of the water, to suffer ourselves to be imposed by counterfeit wares which some persons, by double fraud, export to you in illicit bottoms as raw commodities of British growth, though wholly alien to our soil, in order afterwards to smuggle them back again into this country, manufactured after the newest Paris fashion of improved liberty." *ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>lxxxi</sup> "Our political system is placed in a just correspondence and symmetry with the order of the world and with the mode of existence decreed to a permanent body composed of transitory parts, wherein, by the disposition of a stupendous wisdom,

molding together the great mysterious incorporation of the human race, the whole, at one time, is never old or middle-aged or young, but, in a condition of unchangeable constancy, moves on through the varied tenor of perpetual decay, fall, renovation, and progression. Thus, by preserving the method of nature in the conduct of the state, in what we improve we are never wholly new; in what we retain we are never wholly obsolete.” *ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>lxxxii</sup> “When ancient opinions and rules of life are taken away, the loss cannot possibly be estimated. From that moment we have no compass to govern us; nor can we know distinctly to what port we steer.” *ibid.*, p.25.

<sup>lxxxiii</sup> “There ought to be a system of manners in every nation which a well informed mind would be disposed to relish. To make us love our country, our country ought to be lovely.” *ibid.*

<sup>lxxxiv</sup> “To be attached to the subdivision, to love the little platoon we belong to in society, is the first principle . . . Of public affections. It is the first link in the series by which we proceed toward a love of our country and to mankind. The interest of that portion of social arrangement is a trust in the hands of all those who compose it; and as none but bad men would justify its abuse, none but traitors would barter it away for their own personal advantage.” *ibid.*, p.20.

<sup>lxxxv</sup> “All the pleasing illusions, which made power gentle, and obedience liberal, which harmonized the different shades of life, and which, by a bland the simulation, incorporated into politics the sentiments which beautify and soften private society, are to be dissolved by this new conquering empire of light and reason. All the *decent drapery of life is to be rudely torn off*. All the *super-added ideas*, furnished from the wardrobe of a moral imagination, which the heart owns, and the understanding ratifies, as necessary to cover the defects of her naked shivering nature, and to raise it to dignity in our own estimation, are to be exploded as ridiculous, absurd, and antiquated fashion.” *ibid.*, p.23.

<sup>lxxxvi</sup> “When ancient opinions and rules of life are taken away, the loss cannot possibly be estimated. From that moment we have no compass to govern us; nor can we know distinctly to what port we steer . . . Already there appears a poverty of conception, a coarseness, and a vulgarity in all the proceedings of the Assembly and of all their instructors. Their liberty is not liberal. Their science is presumptuous ignorance. Their humanity is savage and brutal.” *ibid.*, p.26.

<sup>lxxxvii</sup> *ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>lxxxviii</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>lxxxix</sup> Locke thought that the majority was always the correct opinion to follow. I heartily disagree because there can always be truth in the dissent, and even though the dissent may be the minority, its consideration is still necessary.

<sup>xc</sup> “So that however it may be mistaken, the end of law is not to abolish or restrain, but to preserve and enlarge freedom. For in all the states of created beings, capable of laws, where there is no law, there is no freedom. For liberty is to be free from restraint and violence from others, which cannot be where there is no law; and is not, as we are told, ‘a liberty for every man to do what he lists.’ But a liberty to dispose and order freely as he lists his person, actions possessions, and his whole property within the allowance of those laws under which he is, and therein not to be subject to the arbitrary will of another, but freely follow his own.” Locke John, *The Second Treatise On Civil Government*, (Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1986), 33-34.

<sup>xci</sup> *ibid.*, p.42.

<sup>xcii</sup> America still needs to government to perform functions such as FEMA, educational loans, etc.; larger functions that are not impeding upon the rights of Americans without their consent.

<sup>xciii</sup> “Men being, as has been said, by nature all free, equal and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another without his own consent, which is done by agreeing with other men, to join and unite into a community for their comfortable, safe, and peaceable living, one amongst another, in a secure enjoyment of their properties, and a greater security against any that are not of it.” *ibid.*, p.54.

<sup>xciv</sup> “So that their politic societies all began from a voluntary union, and the mutual agreement of men freely acting in the choice of their governors and forms of government.” *ibid.*, p.58.

<sup>xcv</sup> “And to this I say, that every man that hath possession or enjoyment of any part of the dominions of any government doth hereby give his tacit consent, and is as far forth obliged to obedience to the laws of that government, during such enjoyment, as anyone under it, whether this his possession be of land to him and his heirs forever, or a lodging only for a week; or whether it be barely traveling freely on the highway; and, in effect, it reaches as far as the very being of any one within the territories of that government.” *ibid.*, p.67.

<sup>xcvi</sup> *ibid.*, p.82.

<sup>xcvii</sup> Some may argue that by electing representatives to the House and Senate, Americans have given their consent to the government to act according to what it thinks best. This is true, however, the federal government often does not have to go through the House of Senate because of its own vested powers. This is where the consent of Americans has not been given to many of the federal government actions. Americans did not consent to having their personal property taken away or every minute aspect of their lives regulated. Americans did consent to the preservation of freedom and democratic rule yet, this is not the framework that the modern-day federal government is following.

<sup>xcviii</sup> "Their power in the utmost bounds of it is limited to the public good of society. It is a power that hath no other end but preservation, and therefore can never have a right to destroy, enslave, or designedly to impoverish that subjects; the obligations of the law of Nature cease not in society, but only in many cases are drawn closer, and have, their observation." *ibid.* , p.75.

<sup>xcix</sup> *ibid.*, p.85.

<sup>c</sup> Rousseau Jean-Jacques, *A Discourse on Inequality*, (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1984), 67.

<sup>ci</sup> "If I strip the being thus constituted of all the *supernatural gifts* that he may have received, and of all the *artificial faculties* that he can have acquired only through a long process of time, if I consider him, in a word, as he must have emerged from the hand of nature, I see animal less strong than some, less agile than others, but taken as a whole the most advantageously organized of all. I see him satisfying his hunger under an oak, quenching his thirst at the first stream, finding his bed under the same tree which provided his meal; and, behold, his needs are furnished." *ibid.*, p.81.

<sup>cii</sup> "The demands of freedom appeared to be in the direction of the release of large numbers of individuals from the statuses and identities that had been forged in them by the dead hand of the past. A free society would be one in which individuals were morally and socially as well as politically free, free from groups and classes. It would be composed, in short, of socially and morally separated individuals. Order in society would be the product of a natural equilibrium and of economic and political forces. Freedom would arise from the individual's release from all the inherited person interdependences of traditional community, and from his existence in an impersonal, natural, economic order." *ibid.*, p.209.

<sup>ciii</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>civ</sup> Nisbet, p.205.

<sup>cv</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>cvi</sup> "What we can see now with the advantage of hindsight is that, unconsciously, the founders of liberalism abstracted certain moral and psychological attributes from a social organization and considered these the timeless, natural, qualities of the individual, who was regarded as independent of the influences of any historically developed social organization." *ibid.*, p.208.

<sup>cvii</sup> *ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>cviii</sup> *ibid.*, p.239.

<sup>cix</sup> *ibid.*, p.236.